UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,783	06/27/2001	Frank Bahren	Westphal.6313	9614

7590 04/12/2006

Patrick J. O'Shea
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street
Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115

EXAMINER	
CHANKONG, DOHM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,783	BAHREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dohm Chankong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7,10-14,18-23 and 25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7,10-14,18-23 and 25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's arguments, filed 1.23.2006. Claims 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 are presented for further examination.

2> This is a non-final rejection.

Response to Arguments

3> Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7, 10-14, 18-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of new prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4> Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al, U.S Patent No. 6.101.499 ["Ford"] in view of Koning et al, U.S Patent No. 5.731.868 ["Koning"].

5> As to claim 7, Ford discloses a first network which can be linked to a second network, the first network including a plurality of network devices linked with one another and have an associated first address for unique identification in the first network [column 6 <lines 54-57> | column 9 «lines 11-16»], a method for generating a second address for each said device comprising:

manipulating the first address of each device to derive the second address which uniquely identifies each such device in the second network [Figures 5a, 5b | Figures 3A-3C | column 2 <lines 19-21> | column 3 <lines 39-46> | column 8 <lines 50-65> | column 7 <lines 25-64> | column 9 <lines 4-9> | column 10 «line 55» to column 11 «line 33» where: Ford manipulates the Ethernet address of each device by appending a network identifying portion (prefix) to the Ethernet address.].

Ford does not disclose however, manipulating the first address by mathematically summing the first address with a predetermined number, the sum representing the second address.

6> Koning is directed towards an addressing system for dynamically generating a second address for a device in a first network where the device has a first address, the second address representing the device's address in a second network. To this end, Koning discloses manipulating a first address of a device by mathematically summing a predetermined number and the first address to derive the second address which is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number [column 1 «lines 11-19» | column 6 «lines 15-22» | claims 3, 4 and 6]. Ford is also directed towards dynamically generating addresses for devices

but lacks Koning's ability to calculate multiple addresses for different networks from a single address. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Koning's address generation functionality into Ford's scheme. Such a combination would supplement and improve Ford's system by enabling another method of deriving from a single address a plurality of unique network addresses for devices to interact in a plurality of networks.

7> As to claim 10, Ford discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the first network comprises a private network and the second network is a public network [Figure 5C <item 126> | column 2 <lines 43-61> | column 3 <lines 39-46>].

8> As to claim 12, Ford discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the second network comprises the Internet [Figure 5C <item 126>].

9> As to claim 14, as it does not limit or further define over the previously claimed limitations, it is similarly rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 7.

10> As to claim 18, Ford discloses the network of claim 14, wherein the first network comprises a private network and the second network comprises a public network [Figure 5C <item 126> | column 2 <lines 43-61> | column 3 <lines 39-46>].

11> As to claim 20, Ford discloses the network of claim 14, wherein the second network comprises the Internet [Figure 5C <item 126>].

12> Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford and Koning, in further view of the MOST Specification Framework Rev 1.1 ["MOST spec"].

13> As to claim 11, Ford does disclose that the first network comprises s a local area network (LAN) [column 6 <lines 34-37>] but does not specifically disclose that first network is a MOST network.

14> The MOST spec teaches a LAN that is preferably implemented as a MOST network [sections 3 and 8]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Ford's LAN as a MOST network as disclosed by the MOST spec, so Ford's network can obtain the stated advantages of utilizing a higher performance optical fiber network is more robust and faster than a typical network.

15> As to claim 19, as it is merely a network that implements the step of the method of claim 11, it does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 11. Therefore, claim 19 is also rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 11, supra.

16> Claims 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford, Koning and the MOST spec, in further view of Inoue et al, U.S Patent No. 6.163.843 ["Inoue"].

17> As to claim 13, Ford does not disclose a method wherein the first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and the second network.

18> Inoue discloses a method wherein a first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and a second network [Figure 2 <item 1b, 4b> | column 2 <lines 14-20>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a firewall in Ford's first network to securely allow the transmission of messages outside of the first network.

19> As to claim 21, as it is merely a claim to a network that implements the steps of the methods of claim 13, they do not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, they are also rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 13, supra.

20> Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MOST spec, in view of Ford, in further view of Koning.

21> The MOST spec discloses a multimedia system for implementation in a vehicle [section 2.1] comprising:

a plurality of multimedia devices communicably coupled through a communication link to form a private MOST network, wherein each of said plurality of multimedia has associated therewith a first address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in the MOST network [sections 2.4, 2.5, 3.11.1, 4.3.3.1].

The MOST spec does not explicitly disclose that each of said plurality of multimedia devices has associated therewith a second address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in a public network, wherein the second address is derived by mathematically summing a predetermined number to the corresponding first address such that each second address is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number and that each second address is different than the corresponding first address.

22> Ford discloses a plurality of devices that has associated therewith a second address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in the public network, wherein the second address is derived from the corresponding first address [Figures 3A-3C | column 2 <lines 19-21> | column 3 <lines 39-46 and 47-55> | column 8 <lines 50-65> | column 6 <lines 54-60>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Ford's second address generation functionality into the MOST spec's multimedia network to simplify network connection, administration, and connecting to a network outside the private MOST network for MOST spec's multimedia devices [Ford – abstract].

Ford, however, does not expressly disclose mathematically summing to create the second address.

23> Koning is directed towards an addressing system for dynamically generating a second address for a device in a first network where the device has a first address, the second address representing the device's address in a second network. To this end, Koning discloses manipulating a first address of a device by mathematically summing a predetermined number and the first address to derive the second address which is the sum of the first address and the predetermined number [column 1 «lines 11-19» | column 6 «lines 15-22» | claims 3, 4 and 6]. Ford is also directed towards dynamically generating addresses for devices but lacks Koning's ability to calculate multiple addresses for different networks from a single address. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Koning's address generation functionality into Ford's scheme. Such a combination would supplement and improve Ford's system by enabling another method of deriving from a single address a plurality of unique network addresses for devices to interact in a plurality of networks.

Further, Koning's invention is commensurate with the goals of the MOST network. Koning desires to enable a device to interact in a plurality of networks with a variety of addresses mathematically derived from a single address [see Koning, column 1 «lines 11-19» | claim 6]. The combination of Koning, Ford and the MOST spec would create a dynamic network addressing scheme that enables unique addressing of network devices in vehicles.

24> Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MOST spec, Ford and Koning, in further view of Inoue.

25> As to claim 23, the MOST spec does not disclose a multimedia system comprising a firewall residing on the MOST network for linking the MOST network to the public network.

26> Inoue discloses a method wherein a multimedia system comprising a firewall residing on a mobile network for linking the mobile network to the public network [Figure 2 <items 1b, 4b, 6> | column 2 <lines 14-20>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Inoue's network functionality that comprises a firewall into the MOST spec's MOST network to inspect packets as they are leaving the MOST spec's MOST network and to securely allow the transmission of messages outside of the MOST network.

27> As to claim 25, the MOST spec discloses the multimedia system of claim 23 wherein the public network comprises the Internet [section 2.5 - see diagram "MOST Open Model' with TCP/IP network protocol embedded in one of the devices].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is 571.272.3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday [7:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER